

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated March 17, 2004, Applicants respectfully request the Office to enter the above amendments and consider the following remarks. By this amendment, claims 6, 14, 20 and 22 have been amended and no claims have been canceled or added. After entry of this paper, claims 1-22 will remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner: (i) objected to claim 14 as allegedly containing informalities; (ii) rejected claims 6, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly having insufficient antecedent basis for recitations contained therein; and (iii) rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0120680A1 to Greco et al. ("Greco").

#### Claim Objections

The Office objects to claim 14 because of the alleged informality that the claim recites the expression "an Internet."

Applicants amend claim 14 such that the expression now reads "the Internet," as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 6, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly having insufficient antecedent basis for the recitations set forth on page 2 of the Office Action.

Applicants amend claims 6, 20, and 22 to depend on claims 5, 18, and 21, respectively, to provide antecedent basis for the recitations listed by the Office. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 6, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Greco.

Applicants respectfully disagree, and traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons. Applicants respectfully submit that Greco does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a method of setting up a generic security service comprising “*indicating* which types of documents require a signature” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Greco teaches systems and methods that may include basic “electronic signature of the relevant document(s) by the user.” (Greco, paragraphs 0031-0032). Greco’s document preparation software application can also include an electronic signature button or function (see, e.g., Greco, paragraphs 0059-0063). This function, however, simply permits “a user to officially sign a document using, for example, an image of the user’s signature or a digital cryptographic signature,” and/or it allows the user to “provide a signature to a service provider and receive the signature in electronic form.” *Id.* Greco’s systems and methods, however, are unable to perform, *inter alia*, any sort of processing for the purpose of *distinguishing* the types of documents that may require a signature, as recited in claim 1. Greco and, specifically, the portions of Greco cited by the Office, fail to teach or suggest such functionality, as are reflected, for example, in

Fig. 6 and paragraph 0038 of the present application. Thus, Greco does not disclose a method of setting up a generic security service comprising “*indicating* which types of documents require a signature” (emphasis added).

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Greco does not teach or suggest a method of setting up a generic security service comprising “*indicating* which data elements within a respective document require a signature,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Again, neither Greco nor the portions of Greco cited by the Office teach or suggest this signature indication functionality. For example, paragraphs 0030-0033 and 0059-0063 make only broad reference to an electronic signature function, as addressed immediately above. The remaining portions of Greco cited by the Office discuss “electronic and simultaneous collaboration of services related to the document(s),” secure transmission, as well as basic system, software, document provision, and toolbar features, etc. (Greco, paragraphs 0006, 0042, 0047, 0075, 0098, 0101, page 9, claims 19, 38, and 39). Such systems and functionality, however, are unable to perform, *inter alia*, this indication of sub-elements that need signature when the full document does not require signature, as recited in claim 1. Thus, Greco does not teach a method of setting up a generic security service comprising “*indicating* which data elements within a respective document require a signature” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Applicants also submit that the recitation of claim 1 comprising the step of “for each type of said documents requiring a signature, indicating if a signature is required for a full document” has not been addressed by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully

note that Greco does not teach or suggest analysis indicating whether a signature is required on the full document, or just sub-elements therein. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Greco does not teach or suggest a method of setting up a generic security service comprising this recitation.

For at least these reasons, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed. Claims 2-6, which depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 are therefore also allowable over Greco for at least the same reasons.

Additionally, claim 16 is an apparatus claim setting forth generic security service tool recitations bearing relation to the document distinguishing/indicating functionality discussed above. Specifically, claim 16 is directed to software and memory that implements a signature framework, which presents a list of document types that could require a signature and permits a tool user to input which of the document types require a signature. The same portions of Greco have been cited against the security service tool recitations of claim 16 as were cited against claim 1. However, as set forth above, Greco and especially the cited portions of Greco, fail to teach or suggest anything more than a broad “electronic signature function.” Again, Greco does not distinguish document types, e.g., based on signature requirements. Thus, Greco can not “permit a tool user to set up a signature framework for various document types,” “present ... a list of document types that could require a signature,” or “permit [a] tool user to input which of said document types require [a] signature,” as set forth in claim 16. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 16 is distinguishable over Greco for at least the same reasons stated

above with respect to claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed. Claims 17-22, which depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 16 are thus also allowable over Greco for at least these same reasons.

Applicants further submit that Greco does not teach or suggest the recitations of claim 7, which are drawn to additional features for distinguishing sub-elements of documents in the context of signature-related functionality. In general, Greco makes only limited mention of a broad and well-known electronic-signature-providing function, as discussed above. Thus, Greco simply fails to teach or suggest the permitting, indicating, saving and providing functionality set forth in claim 7. For example, Greco fails to teach or suggest “[a] method of facilitating electronic signature of a document residing on a computer ... comprising...saving said signature on said computer as a parameter *separate* from said document” as recited in independent claim 7 (emphasis added). Claim 7 is directed to these types of specific signature functionality.

In contrast, Greco and the cited portions of Greco, teach only the most generic of signature-related functionality. As discussed above, many of the portions of Greco cited by the Office pertain only to secure transmission of documents, and/or basic system, software, document provision, and toolbar features. The additional passages of Greco cited against claim 7, here, similarly miss the mark. For example, “permit[ting] a user to later access the document from any device that has access to [a] network and share the document with others” (Greco, paragraph 0066), “creat[ing] a simultaneous drafting session of a document or provid[ing] the document concurrently to multiple recipients”

(Greco, paragraph 0072)., and "obtain[ing] a document from the client and a selection of one of the available document services, and perform the selected document service on the document" (Greco, claim 41) do not teach or suggest the document indication and signature functionality set forth in claim 7.

For at least these reasons, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed. Claims 8-15, which depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 7 are thus also allowable over Greco for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 19, 2005

By:

  
Andrew Schwaab  
Reg. No. 38,611

Finnegan Henderson Farabow  
Garrett & Dunner L.L.P.  
901 New York Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Attorney direct (650) 849-6643